



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/1992/72
14 February 1992

Original: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
Forty-eighth session
Agenda items 7, 9, 11 (a), 12 and 14

QUESTION OF THE REALIZATION IN ALL COUNTRIES OF THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS CONTAINED IN THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND IN THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS, AND STUDY OF SPECIAL PROBLEMS WHICH THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES FACE IN THEIR EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE THESE HUMAN RIGHTS, INCLUDING:
PROBLEMS RELATED TO THE RIGHT TO ENJOY AN ADEQUATE STANDARD OF LIVING;
FOREIGN DEBT, ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT POLICIES AND THEIR EFFECTS ON THE FULL ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND, IN PARTICULAR, ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
THE DECLARATION ON THE RIGHT TO DEVELOPMENT

THE RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION AND ITS APPLICATION TO PEOPLES UNDER COLONIAL OR ALIEN DOMINATION OR FOREIGN OCCUPATION

FURTHER PROMOTION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS, INCLUDING THE QUESTION OF THE PROGRAMME AND METHODS OF WORK OF THE COMMISSION;

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES AND WAYS AND MEANS WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM FOR IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVE ENJOYMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS

QUESTION OF THE VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS IN ANY PART OF THE WORLD, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO COLONIAL AND OTHER DEPENDENT COUNTRIES AND TERRITORIES

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE SECOND DECADE TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Letter dated 10 February 1992 from the Permanent Representative
of Yugoslavia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed
to the Under-Secretary-General for Human Rights

I have the honour to transmit herewith the "Memorandum of the Government of Yugoslavia on the Yugoslav Crisis" of the Federal Executive Council of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, dated 28 January 1992.

I would like to request that necessary arrangements be made to have the text of this information issued as an official document of the forty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights under agenda items 7, 9, 11 (a), 12 and 14.

(Signed)

Naste Calovski
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
Federal Executive Council
Belgrade, January 28, 1991

M E M O R A N D U M
of the Government of Yugoslavia on the Yugoslav Crisis

In the aim of informing all the United Nations member countries and world public opinion at large on developments in Yugoslavia, particularly during the past year, which have been shaking the country and its inhabitants and causing concern of the entire international community, the Government of Yugoslavia wishes to draw attention to certain specific developments, procedures and behaviour which are of general significance and which could have fatal consequences for many parts of Europe and the world.

Yugoslavia, which has been in existence for 74 years, came into being as a state community of three nations (i.e. Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) in 1918 and after World War II as a federation of six equal nations (the Croats, Macedonians, Montenegrins, Muslims, Serbs and Slovenes) inhabited, in addition to the Yugoslav nations, by members of a number of national minorities. During this period of life together deep and unbreakable links have been established in the economic, cultural, social and personal areas the tearing of which would have very grave consequences.

Two Yugoslav republics, i.e. Slovenia and Croatia, invoking the right of nations to self-determination which was not disputed by the Federation or any of the Yugoslav republics, proclaimed their sovereignty in 1991 and thereby unilaterally, in contravention of the provisions of the Constitution of the common state, and without an agreement having been reached within the framework of the lawful federal bodies in which they too were represented on a parity basis, carried out an act of forcible secession. Under

their influence, Macedonia embarked upon the same path. All this is having a strong impact on the situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina, a republic constituted by three nations.

The Federal Presidency, Assembly and Government as well as the Constitutional Court of Yugoslavia designated these acts as unilateral secession, contravening the Constitution and therefore being null and void at the same time instructing the authorities in the two republics concerned to address all disputed questions together with the other members of the federation in a democratic manner as stipulated by the Constitution, and fully observing the right of nations to self-determination. Instead of doing that, the authorities of the Republic of Slovenia assumed by force the functions of the federal organs on the territory of this Republic (i.e. military affairs, customs, inspection services, etc.). The Government of Yugoslavia requested that the federal bodies continue to exercise their functions on the borders and the Supreme Command of the Yugoslav People's Army decided to deploy 2000 troops along the border with a view to enabling the said federal bodies to perform their duties.

However, the territorial defence units of Slovenia blocked the barracks of the federal army and opened fire on the military convoys heading for the border thereby provoking an armed conflict in which four-fifths of the 60 casualties were soldiers of the federal army who were under orders to gain control over the frontier crossing points without returning fire. The Republic of Slovenia capitalized on this conflict by presenting it abroad as war and aggression against this republic which the Slovenian units had repulsed (a claim that can hardly hold water when it is clear that a well appointed army such as the Yugoslav federal army with several hundred thousand men could have easily gained control of the entire territory of the republic).

Desirous of achieving a peaceful settlement to the Yugoslav crisis or rather of avoiding fresh armed conflicts and further loss of life and material destruction, the Presidency of SFRY decided to

relocate the army units stationed in Slovenia without prejudicing thereby future relations in the country. The Constitutional Court of Yugoslavia called in doubt this decision from the standpoint of the Constitution. The decisions of the Croatian Assembly on secession provoked developments which culminated in an armed conflict that took a tragic toll of several thousand lives, thousands of wounded and irreparable damage to the economy and the population of the country.

Though secessionist forces in Croatia had been operating for some time, problems took a sudden turn for the worse with the electoral victory of the so-called Croatian Democratic Community (HDZ) which won a majority in the Parliament of that republic and which had even in the election campaign relied heavily on national-fascist and Ustashi ideology from the time of the Second World War which caused justifiable fear and mistrust among the Serbs living in those parts of the country.

In order to avoid an escalation of the armed conflict and in view of the lack of readiness on the part of the leadership of the Republic of Slovenia to resolve disputed issues in a peaceful manner and in conformity with the Constitution, the Presidency and Government of Yugoslavia decided to agree to the internationalization of the problem as suggested by the European Community as a regional organization. Even though Yugoslavia was not a member, on the basis of its cooperation with that organization in the past and bearing in mind its orientation towards further expansion, it had hoped that the Community would spare no efforts to find a settlement to the crisis. That was how the Memorandum of Understanding came to be signed by the EEC and Yugoslavia on Brioni Island on July 7, 1991.

The Memorandum had stipulated that "...the complete territorial integrity, sovereignty and international legal personality of SFR Yugoslavia shall be immediately restored and that to that end all the laws, regulations and measures of the Republic of Slovenia and the Republic of Croatia which are not in accord with the Yugoslav

legal system shall be suspended not later than July 12, 1991". It was also decided that the regime provided for by Article 281, point 10 of the Constitution and the Law on Frontier Traffic and relevant regulations that had been in force on the frontiers of SFR Yugoslavia up to June 25, 1991 would be restored at the same time. This also implied the payment of customs duties into the federal budget, as well as placing simultaneously the symbols (coat of arms, flag and frontier signs indicating the name of the state) of SFR Yugoslavia and the Republic of Slovenia at the frontier crossing points. The provisions of the same Memorandum also stipulated that all the representatives of the Republic of Slovenia in the federal bodies and agencies would resume their duties so as to actively contribute to the quest for a settlement of the Yugoslav crisis that would be acceptable for all parties concerned.

Hardly any of the provisions of this Memorandum were put into effect by the Slovenian and Croatian sides which continued with their secession in violation of the provisions of the Constitution as well as of the decisions of the Constitutional Court of Yugoslavia declaring null and void the acts of unilateral secession by the Republic of Slovenia and the Republic of Croatia. The authorities of the Republic of Slovenia did not permit the regime which had been in effect prior to June 25, 1991 to be restored at the frontiers, they did not permit the return of Yugoslav customs authorities to the border, they did not pay any customs duties into the federal budget and they did not put up the symbols of Yugoslavia at the frontier crossing points. Rather, they continued to implement laws, regulations and measures which were not in conformity with the Constitution of Yugoslavia and even adopted additional regulations and measures which derogated the provisions of the Constitution and federal legislation blocking at the same time the work of federal agencies by walking out of them or failing to participate.

The Government of Yugoslavia had on several occasions drawn attention to the European Community to its failure to honour the

commitments it had undertaken under the Brioni Memorandum or to undertake the appropriate measures to implement those commitments. The so-called Brioni Memorandum also established monitoring missions of the European Community to monitor the truce in Slovenia and later their mandate was extended also to the Republic of Croatia after the outbreak of armed conflicts on its territory.

The Croatian Parliament promulgated a new Constitution which unlike the outgoing one, did not refer to the Serbs in Croatia as one of two constituent peoples in that republic. The direct consequence of the new Constitution was the loss of jobs by many citizens of Serbian nationality in Croatia. At about the same time, the police started to harrass and raid the apartments of Serbs in Croatia (there were about 700 thousand of them), the authorities ordered the demolition of their houses on the grounds that they had been illegally erected but this applied exclusively to houses belonging to Serbs built along the Adriatic coast, automobiles with the licence plates of Serbian towns became the target of attack, etc. Strong paramilitary units were formed which were not disarmed in spite of several decisions to that effect by the Presidency and Government of Yugoslavia and which were to become one of the main pillars of the forces which provoked a bloody civil war in Yugoslavia. Large quantities of weapons were illegally imported from Hungary and other countries with which Croats-members of the ruling party were armed.

The civil war in Yugoslavia has brought in its wake the problem of displaced persons and refugees, especially the problem of Serbs driven out of Croatia. Thus for instance, by decision of the Croatian authorities the evacuation was ordered of 27 Serbian villages in the region of Grubiško Polje which were later burnt to the ground and the villagers subjected to unheard-of suffering and terror. The Serbian people in Croatia who had been the victims of one of the cruellest crimes of genocide in human history (entailing hundreds of thousands of victims) felt that its

existence was in jeopardy due to the discriminatory and coercive measures taken by the new Croatian authorities.

The unconstitutional unilateral decision on secession taken by Croatia invoking its right to self-determination, totally ignored the right of the Serbs in Croatia who constituted the majority population in a number of large areas (e.g. Krajina). This part of the Serbian nation which had for decades been living together with the main body of the Serbian nation in a single state, that of Yugoslavia, could not accept the unilateral secession of Croatia that is, the transformation of the administrative boundaries of Croatia which had not been established by even any internal constitutional-legal document, into international borders whereby this part of the people would be separated from the rest of the people remaining in Yugoslavia.

The lack of readiness on the part of the authorities of the Republic of Croatia to address the problem in line with the Constitution and peacefully provoked armed clashes between the new authorities and the people. By decision of the highest bodies of the federation, the federal army was engaged to protect both nations but it thereby became a party to the war defending itself from the attacks by the Croatian paramilitary forces. In the interest of the defence of the Serbian population in the so-called Serb Krajinas the issue was internationalized and the international community appealed to to support a peaceful and democratic settlement. That is why the Presidency and Government of Yugoslavia agreed not only to the establishment of so-called EC monitoring missions but also to the EEC offer of good offices and assistance in seeking out through a conference on peace and with the participation of the organs of the Federation and all six Yugoslav republics a settlement that would be "acceptable for all the parties in Yugoslavia".

Despite the extensive experience of Lord Carrington as the Conference Chairman and the serious efforts of representatives of the EEC and certain member countries, the Conference on Yugoslavia

was soon to show that the good offices which the Yugoslav parties had accepted with hope and trust were turning into a biased attitude towards the secessionist republics while pressure was brought to bear on the others to acquiesce. The principal course taken by the Conference and backed up by acts and measures of certain EC member states supporting secession, was the dissolution of Yugoslavia and the proclamation of independence of all the republics which would only then, having been divided and become independent, negotiate a future arrangement. With the aim of negating and denying the statehood of Yugoslavia, the only holder of international legal personality, early on in the Conference proceedings, the representatives of the Yugoslav federation were denied the right to speak and present their views and, at a later stage, they ceased to participate in the Conference on Yugoslavia (!) and for some time now in spite of repeated requests that they be allowed to participate, no invitations have been addressed to them. Plenary sessions of the Conference on Yugoslavia were frequently scheduled only one or two days in advance and the drafts of documents submitted for adoption were often distributed among participants only a few hours prior to the beginning of meetings or even at the meetings themselves. The republics that did not endorse the drafts were labelled "uncooperative" and sanctions without precedent in inter-state relations were instituted against them by the EC and individual member countries.

The European Community has suspended the implementation of the Agreement on Cooperation between Yugoslavia and the EC with respect to the "uncooperative" republics even though there are no grounds for doing so according to the provisions of the Agreement (not to mention the unacceptable selective implementation in specific areas of a contracting state). Certain EC member states have been resorting to similar impermissible measures bringing pressure to bear on the "uncooperative" republics of Yugoslavia e.g. the Federal Republic of Germany has suspended without any justification and contrary to all rules of international law, the implementation of a number of bilateral and multilateral

agreements, suspending road, river and air traffic with Yugoslavia (subsequently explaining orally that this suspension does not apply to the "cooperative" republics). The Republic of Italy has suspended a bilateral agreement on air traffic again without any legal grounds. Some other non-member countries have followed suit. The Republic of Austria (respecting the delay for the termination of contract) cancelled three bilateral contracts on economic cooperation in the area of transportation and tourism while Switzerland, without prior notice, suspended the validity of a bilateral convention on the abolition of visas for private travel officially informing the Yugoslav party of this decision on the eve of its coming into effect. Canada and the United States also introduced "economic sanctions": Canada selectively against "uncooperative" republics only and the United States against Yugoslavia as a whole (temporary suspension of rights under the General Scheme of Preferences, restrictions on textile imports, temporary suspension of American technical aid).

In addition to all the measures mentioned above, certain countries (i.e. Germany, Hungary, Italy, Bulgaria) by the statements of their highest officials have lent support to secession, denying the international legal personality of Yugoslavia and expressing territorial pretensions towards it. By providing weapons, military equipment and experts in contravention of Security Council Resolutions 717, 721 and 724, by tolerating the recruitment of mercenaries from among their citizens, by ignoring the competences of federal agencies of Yugoslavia and by other similar internationally impermissible acts (the most flagrant examples are reviewed in Annex I) by wholeheartedly supporting secession, those countries have been flagrantly interfering in the internal affairs of Yugoslavia, undermining its sovereignty and territorial integrity all of which can in addition to damaging Yugoslavia, jeopardize peace and security in this part of Europe and beyond.

One of the most flagrant examples of interference in the internal affairs of Yugoslavia was the election of the President of the

Presidency of Yugoslavia and the recognition of the secessionist republics. Some EEC member-countries and a number of other states insisted under strong pressure in 1990 on the election of Mr. Stjepan Mesic, hitherto representative of Croatia to the Yugoslav Presidency, as the President of that Presidency, a move disputed for moral and ethical reasons. Indeed, he had repeatedly stated in public that he would be the last president of Yugoslavia and that he would act towards its dismantlement. In addition, as the former Prime Minister of the Republic of Croatia he had directly supported secession by, among other things, participating in decisions on illegal arms imports. As a result of the resolute pressure by the above mentioned countries, Stjepan Mesic was eventually elected President of the Presidency in the presence of the Ministerial "Troika" of the European Community, to declare only a few months later addressing a televised session of Parliament of the Republic of Croatia: "I have accomplished my task. Yugoslavia is no more". This embittered Yugoslav public opinion and aroused doubts as to the good intentions of the countries which had insisted so much on Mesic being appointed to such a responsible post.

Some Western European countries which had supported secession most resolutely had frequently emphasized in their statements and propaganda campaigns that Croatia and Slovenia were unequal in Yugoslavia paying no attention to the fact that for years and even in the very year of secession the representatives of the Republic of Croatia occupied top-ranking positions in Yugoslavia including: President of the Yugoslav Presidency; President of the Government of Yugoslavia; Minister of Defence who is in command of the Yugoslav People's Army; Minister of Foreign Affairs; Minister of Finance; Minister of Development as well as a large number of other important federal posts including top-ranking positions in Yugoslav diplomatic missions abroad. Generally speaking, this also applies to Slovenia whose representatives had previously held key posts in the Federation and in the present Yugoslav government the posts of Vice-Premier, Minister of Foreign Trade and of

Transport, and a range of other high-ranking posts, particularly in diplomatic and consular missions.

A number of these officials displayed indeed a high degree of loyalty, but the fact remains that many of them, along with the very leaders of the republics of Croatia and Slovenia, worked assiduously both in the country and abroad to dismantle Yugoslavia and assert secession. However, all this would not have led to the known outcome had there been no support to the secession by particular European countries which, guided by their narrow interests, decided to ignore the common interests of the EC and the UN, as well as the fundamental principles of international law. It is noteworthy that the very countries which were Yugoslavia's enemies and occupying forces, most of them so in both world wars (Germany, Austria, Hungary, Italy, Bulgaria), have been in the forefront and the states that have supported secession in an absolutely impermissible manner and they are the ones which are in various ways endeavouring to present territorial claims to particular parts of Yugoslavia. The Yugoslav government does not wish to claim that this testifies to the reemergence of the "Axis powers" of the World War II, nor that the governments of the countries concerned are thereby promoting further the policy of war hostilities towards Yugoslavia dating back to that period, but it does wish to point up the fact that such action can only exacerbate the antagonisms and animosity among nations inherited from the past, instead of overcoming them through mutual understanding and cooperation, by resolute removal of any vestiges of history as well as any attempts to revive them. It is only in this way that we can join fully in the processes of European integration, which this Government is advocating.

The Hague Declaration of the European Community underscores explicitly that the question of recognition of particular republics as states will be addressed only at the end of the negotiating process ("It is essential for all the parties concerned to participate so as to devise a political solution based on the prospect of recognition for all the republics wishing

it at the end of the negotiating process conducted in good faith"). In direct conflict with the above stand, the EC passed its Brussels Declaration introducing criteria and a procedure for the recognition of the Yugoslav republics which was scheduled to take place on January 15. By this act, the EC called on the Yugoslav republics to apply for recognition (!) and instead of providing good offices it arbitrarily proclaimed itself the official international forum for the recognition of states. Some of the EC member states did not honour even wait for the given deadline, but flauntingly declared their recognition of the independence of the secessionist states almost a month ahead of time (e.g. FR Germany). In the same flaunting manner and wishing to "set an example" for the others, the Vatican followed suit but preceded it by publishing a Memorandum on Yugoslavia openly supporting the secessionist "Catholic" republics. Eventually, and despite the fact that it had entrusted the Arbitration Commission made up of five eminent Presidents of the Constitutional Courts of a number of EC member states with assessing the eligibility of particular republics for recognition, the EC decided without taking any note of the position and assessment of its Arbitration Commission* which republics met the requirements for recognition.

We have noted with satisfaction the constructive and balanced attitude of the permanent members of the Security Council which shoulder the heaviest responsibility for peace and security in the world. China, the Russian Federation and the USA have so far not recognized the secessionist republics, while the United Kingdom and France, notwithstanding their "solidarity" with the other EC member states, have refrained from establishing diplomatic ties. Taking also into account the complexity of the problem and the view that unilateral secession constitutes an abuse of the right

* All five members of the Commission were appointed by the EC. Namely, it had been decided that three members be appointed by the EC and two by the Yugoslav Presidency, and by unanimity (which is in violation of relevant Yugoslav laws which do not envisage any unanimous Presidency decisions).

of peoples to self-determination, the principles of legality and respect for international law, we were able to note with appreciation that almost all the nonaligned and other countries which are guided by the objective standards and principles of international law have abandoned the idea of recognizing the two secessionist Yugoslav republics. Typically, among the first few countries to recognize the secession of Croatia were precisely those which also in the period of World War II had recognized the so-called NDH (the Independent State of Croatia) and maintained diplomatic-consular relations with that fascist quisling entity..

In parallel to all the mentioned efforts in support of secessionism, an organized media campaign has been mounted particularly in the West European media, by the Republic of Croatia and the Republic of Slovenia with the assistance of certain circles in those countries (including statements by highest ranking officials of some of those countries), to demonstrate that Yugoslavia is no more, that the war is the result of the aggression of the Yugoslav People's Army and the Republic of Serbia on the peaceful population of Croatia, that the JNA troops, volunteers and the territorial defence units in the Serbian Krajinas are violating the ceasefire and committing crimes, while covering up the truth, i.e. that the most atrocious crimes of genocide* and war crimes are being committed precisely by the Croatian paramilitary units and foreign mercenaries and that the ceasefire is being violated by those same forces. Certain world media have even broadcast anonymous and false reports by EC monitors on the alleged crimes committed by the Federal Army, which can best be verified with the very observer missions themselves. It is hard to believe that such false reports are the result of the abuse by any EC monitors, but it is noteworthy that with the deployment of UN officers with the units on both sides

* Having reviewed the atrocious crimes of genocide perpetrated against the Serbian people, the Presidency of SFRY proposed to the Yugoslav Assembly the appointment of a special commission to investigate and determine these crimes.

this form of propaganda warfare against the JNA has stopped, and the ceasefire has been observed much more consistently.

In order to facilitate secession, the authorities of the secessionist republics have inaugurated the term "disassociation", instead of the proper international term of secession. In this way they wanted to ensure not only the secession of the two republics from Yugoslavia which is not disputable if done in a democratic manner and in compliance with the Constitution of the common state, but rather the fragmentation of the whole federation so that the rump federation, i.e. the republics which do not wish to secede, would lose its international-legal personality.

The elaboration and use of this idea was also prompted by a rather biased attitude of the Arbitration Commission which claimed that it was not secession that was at issue but rather "the dissolution of Yugoslavia" (another term unknown in international law). The Commission has further failed to take into account the Federal Constitution and national legislation and the decisions and opinions of the Constitutional Court of Yugoslavia, which has greatly surprised particularly the professional circles.

The above overview of events and procedures related to the Yugoslav crisis clearly shows that, regrettably, Yugoslavia has witnessed the following:

- the recognition of secession as a means of creating a state as opposed to the right to self-determination which can never be exercised to the detriment of others and contrary to the standards of national and international law;

- the gross violation of international law and the principles enshrined in the UN Charter, on the basis of which relations in the international community, and primarily those among different states, have been built and developed for almost half a century ;

- the gross unilateral violation and termination of various international treaties which Yugoslavia has entered into with the EC, its individual member states and other countries ;
- an upsurge of violence, pressure, economic sanctions and other forms of coercion in international relations, as opposed to the principles of cooperation, tolerance, reciprocal respect, sovereign equality of states and non-interference in internal relations;
- gross interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign country, a founding member of the UN, of the CSCE and other international organisations, and thereby the undermining of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and international-legal personality of Yugoslavia.

All these and other above mentioned developments and procedures constitute an open threat to international peace and security and forebode a new world conflict mankind could be drawn into if they are not only unanimously condemned but also most resolutely resisted. In other words, instead of building the so-called new international democratic order, the world could plunge headlong into a cataclysm, as the rule of the muscle and the right of the stronger in international relations may lead to the use of weaponry which has never before been used in the history of mankind.

The Yugoslav government is hopeful that the arrival of UN peacekeeping troops to Yugoslavia, at the invitation of the Presidency of SFRY and with the consent of all the parties to the conflict, will make it possible for the Yugoslav peoples to peacefully and democratically settle all the issues related to their future arrangement, with full respect for the UN Charter, the CSCE instruments and international law and honouring the right of every nation to decide its future destiny by exercising its right to self-determination. The Government also hopes that the Conference on Yugoslavia, through the unswerving personal effort

of Lord Carrington , and once it reverts to its original mandate of good offices, will overcome difficulties and resolutely reject the methods and procedures which are not suited to the present-day relations among countries. The EC and the governments of those countries which have, regardless of their intentions, by their mentioned actions and by unilaterally supporting secession inflicted grave damage on Yugoslavia and its bilateral relations with it, are expected to take the extended hand of cooperation and mutual respect with more understanding and sincerity and in good faith, as they used to do for years prior to the Yugoslav crisis. The Government of Yugoslavia also expects the larger-scale involvement of the UN and the Security Council, and expresses its appreciation for the remarkable contribution made by the UN Secretary-General and his personal envoy Mr. Vance.

Profoundly regretting the numerous sacrifices suffered by the civilian population in the armed clashes at the peak of the Yugoslav crisis as well as the tragic loss of the lives of five members of the EC monitoring mission and a number of foreign journalists, the Government of Yugoslavia hopes that such tragic events will never again occur anywhere in the world. This will be possible only if the principles of legality and the constitutional and international order are fully observed and if power and pressure disappear from both the national and the international scenes.

As one of the founding members of the UN and the Nonaligned Movement, and without disputing the right of every nation to self-determination, Yugoslavia expects all countries to show understanding for its efforts in defence of its sovereignty and international-legal personality, and to abstain from any actions which are posing a threat to our country today and , if tolerated further, may tomorrow prove fatal also for other countries.

The Government of Yugoslavia shall make every effort to see the Yugoslav crisis resolved peacefully and in a democratic manner.
